UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,299	04/20/2001	David Kerr	19111.0055	1841

23517 7590 07/18/2008

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
2020 K Street, N.W.
Intellectual Property Department
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/838,299	KERR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-6,8-10,12-14 and 16-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-6,8-10,12-14 and 16-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/10/2008 has been entered.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14 and 16-18 remain pending.

Claims 1, 8, 14, and 17 are independent claims.

Claims 7 and 11 were cancelled with this amendment.

Specification

The disclosure remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the acronym "REP" on Page 1, Line 10 should be amended to – ERP – because it appears to be a typographic error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan (U.S. Patent No. 4,982,344 filed 05/18/1988, issued 01/01/1991) in view of Trigg ("Supporting Collaboration in Notecards," copyright 12/1986, pages 153-162).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Jordan discloses:

- *A method of defining a link between first and second applications windows on a processing system, the processing system having a database …* (Title; Abstract; Col. 1, lines 1-8 → creation of links between cards (a workspace or window each of which occupies part of the screen space and may contain text, graphics, bitmap images, etc.) or other workspaces that may be linked into a network), *the-method comprising operating the end station so as to:*
  - *(a) display a first applications window* (Col. 17, lines 64-67; Figs. 6, 9 → an initial card (window containing a workspace within its confines) containing an AutoLink button (e.g., see Figs. 1A-B, Fig. 6) is displayed on a workstation screen);
  - *(b) cause the processing system to define a link between the first application windows and a second application window in response to the*

display of the second applications window, the link defining a sequence of access from the first application window to the second application window; (Col. 18, line 1 through Col. 19, line 31; Figs. 1A-B, 6, 9 → a user selects the AutoLink button on the initial card with the left mouse button to begin the link and card creation process (link defining mode is now engaged). The user is presented with a "Link To:" menu (Fig. 9, step 350). The menu is superimposed on the selected AutoLink button as illustrated in Fig. 10. A quick down and up click to select the AutoLink button will thus begin the creation of a new card (displaying a second applications window) and a link to is established; the link "linking" the first and second cards together. There are also other options to link the first card to another existing card).

- *(c) create a table for storing link data defining the link, the table being stored on the database…* (Col. 9, line 64 through Col. 12, line 18; Col. 18, lines 33-39; Fig. 9 → step in box 360 (Fig. 9) creates the new card's (second window) data unit, which includes setting up a hash (database) table entry for the new card as well as constructing the data unit itself (it is noted that the initial card also has these features). The data unit includes parameters and contents of the card's type, including the title and a value indicating whether the new card should be displayed. The data structure, hash also contains information on the links between cards (see Col. 10, beginning line 5).

It is noted that Jordan generally describes a "standalone" system in that the "end-unit" or client is not connected to a network external to the client (Jordan's invention is related to improvements to an existing Xerox® product called Note Cards, which was clearly designed as standalone (see Halasz, NPL reference U on Form 892 for review).

Thus, Jordan does not disclose:

- *… and at least one remote end station coupled to the database via a communications system.*

However, Trigg discloses *and at least one remote end station coupled to the database via a communications system* (see Pgs. 158-159; specifically right-hand column, paragraph beginning "In order to study" → extensions to the Note Card system that would allow users to collaborate by accessing shared spaces between their computers connected via a network).

In addition, Jordan fails to disclose:

- *… the table being stored on the database in association with a user identifier.*

However, Trigg discloses *… the table being stored on the database in association with a user identifier* (Pg. 156, 3rd paragraph through at least Pg. 157, left-hand column, 2nd paragraph → Trigg describes multiple users accessing Note Cards where comments/annotations, as well as links to

Note Cards are identified by the individual users creating links from their defined "comment cards" to common Note Cards that the group is working on (commenting on)).

Trigg further describes the use of a "History Card," which is defined for each user and summarizes the comments/annotations, as well as links made by each user and generally what each user in the collaboration did during each commenting session. The fact that each user of the collaboration has its own History Card would strongly suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that each History Card is distinguished by some sort of identification associated with the user to which the Card belonged.

Thus, Trigg discloses the storage of information, including link information for multiple users of the Note Card system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Jordan and Trigg as both references concern improvements to an existing system (Xerox® Note Cards). Adding the disclosure of Trigg allows Jordan to collaborate between computers that are networked together.

Jordan further fails to disclose:

- *so that when the user identifier is used to access the processing system a sequence of access from the first application window to the second application window is provided when the user accesses the first application window and wherein additional link data for links defining a sequence of access between application windows can be stored on the database in associated with the user identifier.*

However, Trigg discloses *so that when the user identifier is used to access the processing system a sequence of access from the first application window to the second application window is provided when the user accesses the first application window and wherein additional link data for links defining a sequence of access between application windows can be stored on the database in associated with the user identifier* (see Pg. 156, 3rd paragraph through at least Pg. 157, left-hand column, 2nd paragraph; and Pgs. 158-159; specifically right-hand column, paragraph beginning "In order to study" → Trigg describes a History card is generated at the end of each collaboration session and contains a history of what was done during the session including any linking that was performed between cards as well as the identity of the collaborators. Presumably, when a new session is invoked by the collaborators, the previous History card is accessed and the collaboration environment is

restored to the state when it was last accessed including any edits and links between cards that were previously made).

Thus, Trigg stores in a History card (a database of sorts) a history or "state" of the collaboration "to-date" containing annotations, additions, links between cards, and the identities of the collaborators.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Jordan and Trigg as both references concern improvements to an existing system (Xerox® Note Cards). Adding the disclosure of Trigg allows Jordan to collaborate between computers that are networked together and to store a history of the collaboration effort allowing the collaborators to continue where they left off.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Jordan discloses:

- *step (b) comprises operating the end station so as to: (i) cause the processing system to enter a link defining mode; and then, (ii) display the second application window* (Col. 18, line 1 through Col. 19, line 31; Figs. 1A-B, 6, 9 → a quick down and up click to select the AutoLink button will thus begin the creation of a new card (displaying a second applications window) and a link to is established; the link "linking" the first and second cards together. There are also other options to link the first card to another existing card).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Jordan discloses:

- *link is defined to allow the second applications window to be displayed directly from the first application window* (Col. 1, lines 19-24 → a card can be connected to another card by a link, represented within the contents of the originating card by a display object called a link icon, which may be a box with the title of the destination card. When a user selects a link's icon with a mouse button click, the destination card of that link is displayed. In addition, whether or not the card linked to by the originating card is displayed or not is determined at the time the link is established between the two cards (see Col. 18, lines 47-48).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Jordan discloses:

- *the end station is adapted to present the link within the first application window* Col. 1, lines 19-24; Figs. 1A-B → a card can be connected to another card by a link, represented within the contents of the originating card by a display object called a link icon, which may be a box with the title of the destination card. When a user selects a link's icon with a mouse button click, the destination card of that link is displayed).

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Jordan discloses:

- *the link is defined as an icon within the first application window* (Col. 6, lines 13-20; Figs. 1A-B → icon is displayed in response to clicking the AutoLink button).

In regard to Claim 8, Claim 8 merely recites a processing system for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, Jordan in view of Trigg discloses every limitation of Claim 8, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Jordan discloses:

- *the display displaying a displayed application window* (see Figs. 1A-B, 10; Note Cards are displayed on the user's display screen).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Jordan discloses:

- *the step of defining a link comprises causing the end station processor to:*
    - *(a) determine the first and second application windows* (Col. 17, lines 64-67; Figs. 6, 9 → a initial (first) card (window containing a workspace within its confines) containing an AutoLink button (e.g., see Figs. 1A-B, Fig. 6) is displayed on a workstation screen; Col. 18, line 1 through Col. 19, line 31; Figs. 1A-B, 6, 9 → a user selects the AutoLink button on the initial card with the left mouse button to begin the link and card creation process … a quick down and up click to select the AutoLink button will thus begin the creation of a new card (displaying a second applications window) and a link to is established; the link "linking" the first and second cards together. There are also other options to link the first card to another existing card).
    - *(b) generate link data including an indication of the first and second applications windows; and, (c) transfer the link data to the database* (Col.

9, line 64 through Col. 12, line 18; Col. 18, lines 33-39;Fig. 9 → step in box 360 (Fig. 9) creates the new card's (second window) data unit, which includes setting up a hash (database) table entry for the new card as well as constructing the data unit itself (it is noted that the initial card also has these features). The data unit includes parameters and contents of the card's type, including the title and a value indicating whether the new card should be displayed. The data structure, hash also contains information on the links between cards (see Col. 10, beginning line 5)).

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Jordan fails to disclose:

- *step (c) comprises causing the end station processor to transfer the link data to the second processor, and wherein the second processor is adapted to store the link data in the database in association with the user identifier.*

However, Trigg discloses *step (c) comprises causing the end station processor to transfer the link data to the second processor, and wherein the second processor is adapted to store the link data in the database in association with the user identifier* (Pgs. 156-157 → multiple users accessing Note Cards where comments on changes to Note Cards are identified by the individual users creating links from their defined "comment cards" to common Note Cards that the group is working on (commenting on). In addition, Trigg also discloses the use of a History card, which is defined by each user and summarizes the comment links made and generally what each user

did during a commenting session. These files are identified with the user's identification.

Specifically, Trigg discloses a Distributed Note Card system that allows users to simultaneously share access from their workstation to note files residing on any machine on the local networks.

Presumably, if Note Cards (containing link data) can be shared between networked workstations, where one user workstation is considered the "end station" while another on the network is considered as the "centre processor", then link data between cards can be transferred as well as note files containing specific user identifiers.

Trigg also discusses Access Contention and contention resolution (Pg. 158) whereby access to information is a draft passing note file may be restricted and within the Distributed Note Card system, permissions to make modifications to a Note Card is restricted to one person at a time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that one such way to implement such a restriction would have been by password protection, thus avoiding situations where more than one user accesses and edits a given Note Card.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Jordan and Trigg as both references concern improvements to an existing system (Xerox® Note Cards). Adding the disclosure of Trigg allows Jordan to collaborate between computers that are networked together.

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Jordan fails to disclose:

- *in use the end station processor is adapted to receive and transfer the user identifier to the second processor, and the second processor is adapted to transfer any link data stored in the database in accordance with the received user identifier, to the end station.*

However, Trigg discloses *in use the end station processor is adapted to receive and transfer the user identifier to the second processor, and the second processor is adapted to transfer any link data stored in the database in accordance with the received user identifier, to the end station* (Pgs. 156-157 → multiple users accessing Note Cards where comments on changes to Note Cards are identified by the individual users creating links from their defined "comment cards" to common Note Cards that the group is working on (commenting on).

Specifically, Trigg discloses a Distributed Note Card system that allows users to simultaneously share access from their workstation to note files residing on any machine on the local networks.

Note Cards (containing link data) can be shared between networked workstations, where one user workstation is considered the "end station" while another on the network is considered as the "centre processor", and link data between cards can be transferred as well as note files containing specific user identifiers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Jordan and Trigg as both references concern improvements to an existing system (Xerox® Note Cards). Adding the disclosure of Trigg allows Jordan to collaborate between computers that are networked together.

In regard to Claim 14, Claim 14 merely recites a client system for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, the combination of Jordan with Trigg discloses every limitation of Claim 14, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to Claim 16, Claim 16 merely recites a processing system for performing the method of Claim 11. Thus, the combination of Jordan with Trigg discloses every limitation of Claim 16, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 11.

In regard to Claim 17, Claim 17 merely recites a database centre for use in a processing system for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, the combination of Jordan with Trigg discloses every limitation of Claim 17, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 18, Jordan discloses:

- *the database stores applications data associated with the first and second applications windows* (Col. 9, line 64 through Col. 12, line 18; Col. 18, lines 33-39;Fig. 9 → step in box 360 (Fig. 9) creates a new card (second window) data unit, which includes setting up a hash (database) table entry for the new card as well as constructing the data unit itself (it is noted that the initial card also has these features data unit, hash, etc.). The data unit includes parameters and contents of the card's type, including the title and a value indicating whether the new card should be displayed. The data structure, hash also contains information on the links between cards (see Col. 10, beginning line 5). Thus, databases associated with each of the cards stores information related to that Note Card including its relationships via links to other Note Cards).

Response to Arguments

With regard to Claims 1, 8, 14, and 17, Applicants argue that the prior art of Jordan fails to disclose the amended limitation reciting, *"c. create a table for storing link data defining the link, the link data being stored on the database in association with a user identifier so that when the user identifier is used to access the processing system a sequence of access from the first application window to the second application window is provided when the user accesses the first application window and wherein additional*

link data for links defining a sequence of access between application windows can be stored on the database in associated with the user identifier."

First, there perhaps is some confusion as to what a table is. A table, as discussed/described in the Applicant's Specification (see at least Pg. 1, lines 25-27; Pg. 4, lines 7-17) is a record or entry in a database or data structure. Thus, creating a table is creating or generating a record to be stored in a data structure such as a database (sometimes called a table itself) and not the actual creation of the database or data structure as its seems is implied in the independent claims.

In other words, Applicant's invention appears to create records of links and not a database to contain those records. Applicant's invention merely generates an entry or record containing link information. Jordan also discloses this feature.

Jordan has a defined data structure (i.e. database) comprising a table that when the Auto Link button is selected creates a new entry in that data structure (database) to contain the link information (see Figure 4).

Applicant appears to suggest that their invention creates a database or data structure and stores link information in that structure. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Second, it is unclear to the Examiner what portion of limitation (c) as recited above for Claim 1 the Applicant is claiming as not being taught by Jordan.

In the previous rejection, the Examiner cited Jordan as teaching the *"... creat[ion] of a table for storing link data defining the link, the link data being stored on the database..."* but not that the stored link data is associated with a user identifier. Trigg however was cited to teach this portion of the limitation.

The additional claim language provided in this amendment is also taught by Trigg. The Applicant is referred to the present rejection of Claim 1 above.

Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
07/17/2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100